

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the final Office Action dated January 6, 2010. Claims 1 and 3 to 16 are in the application, with Claims 7 to 12 and 14 to 16 having been withdrawn from consideration. Of the claims presented for examination, Claims 1 and 13 are independent. Claims 1 and 13 have been amended. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 3 to 6 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0123072 (Spronk). Reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested.

Independent Claim 1 as amended generally concerns an image processing apparatus for performing print simulation through a computer network. The image processing apparatus includes a device selector, arranged to select a target printer on the network as a print simulation target, and to select another printer on the network which is used to output a simulation result of the target printer, wherein the whole of the image processing apparatus and the other printer are present at a single site, the target printer is present at another site, and the two sites are connected through the network, and a profile selector, arranged to select a profile required for a color matching process of the print simulation through the network, and to set the selected profile in the target printer. The image processing apparatus further includes a first transmitter, arranged to transmit image data on which are to be performed a color matching process and a rasterizing process to the target printer, wherein the target printer performs the color matching process according to the selected profile on received image data, and rasterizes the image data on which the color matching process has been performed. In addition, the image processing apparatus

includes a receiver, arranged to receive rasterized image data from the target printer, and a second transmitter, arranged to transmit the received and rasterized image data to the other printer so as to print an image that simulates color of an image which the target printer will print.

Thus, among its many features, Claim 1 provides that (i) the whole of the image processing apparatus and the other printer are present at a single site, (ii) the target printer is present at another site, and (iii) the two sites are connected through the network. The applied reference of Spronk is not seen to disclose or suggest at least these features.

The Office Action compares the claimed image processing apparatus with Spronk's color management system 10, the claimed other printer with Spronk's printing press 22, the claimed target printer with Spronk's color printer 18, and the claimed network with Spronk's distributed network 28. See Spronk, Figure 1.

However, Spronk's color management system 10 as a whole is seen to include all components in Figure 1, such as the components the Office Action alleges fall into in the claimed single site and the claimed other site, and such as distributed network 28. Spronk is therefore not seen to disclose that the whole of color management system 10 and printing press 22 are present at a single site, color printer 18 is present at another site, and the two sites are connected through distributed network 28.

Accordingly, Spronk is not seen to disclose or suggest that (i) the whole of the image processing apparatus and the other printer are present at a single site, (ii) the target printer is present at another site, and (iii) the two sites are connected through the network.

Claim 1 is therefore believed to be allowable over the applied reference.

In addition, independent Claim 13 is a method claim which generally corresponds to apparatus Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 13 is believed to be allowable for the same reasons.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the claims, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

No claim fees are believed due. However, should it be determined that additional claim fees are required under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or 1.17, the Director is hereby authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account 06-1205.

Finally, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner conduct a personal or telephonic interview with Applicant's representative regarding this case, before the Examiner takes this filing into consideration. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact Applicant's representative as indicated below.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa,
California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to
our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/John D. Magluyan/
John D. Magluyan
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 56,867

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 4774131v1